HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVII, No. 6 Thursday, February 11, 1960 Washington, D. C.

News Section

REUTHER: *Controlling the candidates* .... (page 1)
ROCKY: *Hard-running "non-candidate"* ..... (page 1)
INTERIOR: *More empire-building* ..... (page 2)
MORSE: *The unions' friend?* ..... (page 2)
COURTS: *Injustice in California* ..... (page 4)

Reuther and Democrats: From within the high echelon of the Democratic party comes intelligence to HUMAN EVENTS that Walter Reuther has made his deals with certain aspirants for that party's nomination and has clinched his control on whomever the Los Angeles convention chooses next summer.

According to this information, the "man who has a first mortgage on the Democratic party" has taken two decisive steps: (1) He has narrowed the field of Democratic candidates for the No. 1 spot on the ticket to Humphrey, Kennedy and Symington. (All three have voted faithfully along the Reuther line.) He has definitely ruled out Senator Lyndon Johnson. By implication, he has indicated that Adlai Stevenson has no chance of winning at Los Angeles. (2) He has made deals with Humphrey, Kennedy and Symington, ensuring that he—Reuther—will name his man (so far not revealed) as Democratic National Chairman if any one of these gets the nomination.

So far he has not sought to dictate which of the three will receive his all-out support in coming months. But all information points to Humphrey as his favorite. However, the wily political labor boss intends to watch the tides of public opinion, the continuing game of "musical chairs" among the hopefuls for nomination and, above all, the results of primary contests. By the time the convention opens, he may well have made a final choice. And he controls sufficient delegates to enforce it.

In the above picture, the big deal that Reuther has accomplished is guaranteeing his control of the Chairmanship of the party. As suggested by HUMAN EVENTS on October 21, 1959, Reuther is prepared for the possibility—nay, probability—that Nixon will be nominated and win the election. In such an event, he wants his man to be the caretaker of the Democratic party after its defeat in November and during the following four years. The Reuther caretaker would then prepare the way—by his control of the party machinery—for the nomination of Reuther himself as Democratic candidate in 1964 if circumstances then prove favorable. Of course, if the political and economic climate changes before election and leads to GOP defeat, then he will have one of the three as his hand-picked candidate. However events turn out, Reuther will remain in the driver's seat of the Democratic party.

Not Merely Gossip: In the course of last week's White House meeting between the President and congressional leaders, an incident reportedly took place which caused no little embarrassment to the usually cocksure "liberal" Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming. The latter was present as an authority on legislation involving Federal aid to education.

Flemming said that many school districts out in the country are "in trouble" and need Federal funds. All eyes turned to President Eisenhower, whose aversion to the principle of Federal aid to local schools is well known. But it remained for Senate GOP Leader Dirksen to put the HEW Secretary on the spot.

"Mr. Secretary," asked Senator Dirksen, "how many school districts in the country are in trouble?" Flemming hesitated and then answered: "About 200." Dirksen then asked: "And how many school districts are there altogether in the whole country?" Even more reluctantly, the now perspiring Flemming had to reply: "About 40,000."

Rockefeller: The Capitol Hill image of Nelson Rockefeller as an out-and-out bogus Republican took on more muscle last week with continued press reports of the gregarious glamor boy's activities and his goings on at the recent Washington dinner with Ike.

GOPers who attended the $100-a-plate dinner in the Nation's Capital were amazed at the manner in which the New York governor left his dinner partner without touching a morsel. Nelson commenced to buttonhole any and all political figures in sight. Waiters were ready to clear the tables before the self-styled non-candidate dropped his last supercharged "gee whiz" and left.

When questioned at the dinner by Scripps-Howard reporter Ed Koterba on whether he would accept a Democratic Presidential draft, Rocky smiled and patted him on the neck. Wrote Koterba: "Now what did it signify? He hadn't said yes, and he hadn't said no . . . . He's a Republican, but after all Wendell Willkie, once a Democrat, got the Republican nomination . . . [Rockefeller] could still get caught in a draft."

Meanwhile "liberal" Democrats are getting long mileage out of the idea that Rocky was victimized by GOP organization leaders, who supposedly denied him a fair crack at the nomination. Observers note Nelson has encouraged such talk by his current refusal to mention Vice President Nixon in public talks and his martyr-like attitude when the nomination is mentioned.

Recalling this Rockefeller attitude and the fact that Rockefellerites are pointing toward his state's March 8 Presidential Primary, New Hampshire's Governor Wesley Powell, who backs Nixon, stated last week: "Mr.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rockefeller perhaps has not removed himself as firmly as had been supposed after his announcement of withdrawal."

Adding to the slim-chance-at-first-glance theory that the Democrats might draft the Empire State's benevolent billionaire, New York *Daily News* Albany reporter Jim Desmond wrote last week: "there are many Republicans here who insist that Rockefeller is really a New Dealer in GOP clothing."

In any event, many top Republicans are now worried that Rockefeller may be thinking of Nelson first and the GOP last, a possibility they don't relish in a Presidential election year.

World Court: The Senate Foreign Relations Committee began hearings January 26 on the Connally reservation which limits the World Court's intervention into American legal questions (HUMAN EVENTS, February 4). The New York State Bar Association met January 29 to consider a repeal resolution.

Although the Senate hearings have been recessed until February 17, the Bar Association's meeting was a study in alert patriotism's ability to ward off the rushing tactics of World Courters who wanted to push through a resolution damning the vital safeguard.

Credit for a fine pro-Connally turnout goes to a group of Manhattan ladies active in conservative affairs who called lawyer friends, and the New York Daily News, which editorialized: "How about a lot of patriotic lawyers showing up at the meeting and voting against this resolution?" Conservatives present reported the World Courters were amazed at the anti-resolution turnout.

Contacting the Bar Association, HUMAN EVENTS was told that the organization was "terribly embarrassed" in front of the press, but that no vote had been taken because a truck coming from Albany to New York with Bar Association committee reports on the matter didn't arrive in time. The spokesman couldn't confirm reports that the truck had a flat tire near Hyde Park after word got out that the World Courters couldn't carry the day.

Budget Battle: First sign of a grassroots campaign to aid President Eisenhower in his battle to balance the Budget comes from the Nashville *Banner*. The Tennessee paper is running a special box on its front page each day, telling readers, "To hold the Budget line, let your voice be heard."

The box continues: "If you believe in a balanced Budget, with spending cut to essentials; if you want the Federal Government to curb inflation by living within a reasonable income and eliminating the deficit; if you oppose further adventuring in the morass of waste, debt, and inevitable tax increases accruing thereto .... WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN!" Congressmen from Tennessee and nearby states are listed to aid interested citizens.

Economy advocates on Capitol Hill are heartily in favor of the *Banner's* campaign; but, they urge, more of the same is needed from papers in other areas to avert the danger from the spending lobbies now so noticeable on the Hill.

Empire-Building: Evidence of the "empire-building" in the Interior Department (as reported by HUMAN EVENTS January 28) has come from Representative Keith Thomson (R.-Wyo.), member of the House Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee. After studying the Budget requests of Interior Secretary Fred Seaton, Thomson charged that "empire-building by bureaucrats is increasing, but funds for sorely-needed programs are decreasing.

"In fact, the Budgets are administrative top-heavy and fund increases requested will never get down to the field level where they are needed, where they belong and where they do the most good," said Thomson.

Thomson cited the Bureau of Mines station at Laramie, Wyoming, where, he said, "the Interior Department last year laid off two or three full-time and several part-time research workers, the ones actually doing the work, instead of cutting out the swivel-chairs in the administrative offices in Washington and other places."

Another example the Wyoming Congressman noted was the Bureau of Land Management's grazing program. In five years, employees have risen from 1700 *to* 2700 *and appropriations have doubled (from* $12 *million to* $24 *million), but the actual field work is declining.*

"We need actual programs in the field, not more bureaucracy in Washington," Thomson stressed, and many on Capitol Hill agree with the legislator. Moreover, some observers are becoming convinced that such bureaucratic "empire-building" at the expense of actual research may be one reason why rural areas in the West turned against the GOP in the 1958 elections.

Morse Code: More difficult than getting a drunk to walk a straight line, quips Capitol Hill, is getting Senator Wayne Morse (D.-Ore.) to *talk* a straight line. Morse recently won great favor with organized labor when he made and distributed a film in which he bitterly attacked Senator John Kennedy for Kennedy's part in passage of last year's labor reform bill. The film, which has been described by one observer as "28 minutes of uninterrupted Morse," has been in such demand by unions that Morse had to film a repeat performance.

HUMAN EVENTS now learns that Morse, the self-acclaimed champion of organized labor, filmed his epic work in the non-union Senate recording studio, which has for over ten years been attacked by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers as a "non-union, low wage shop." To avoid this criticism, Senator Hubert Humphrey and several other senators use outside commercial studios which are unionized.

When contacted by HUMAN EVENTS, the AFL-CIO—whose regional organizations had bought several copies of Morse's film—had "no comment whatsoever."

Federal Aid: The Committee on Economic Development proposed last week that eleven states, ten of them in the South, should receive Federal school aid.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The CED, composed largely of educators and businessmen, nevertheless rejected blanket Federal aid to all states. It called for "Federal supplementation of local and state funds necessary for the improvement of schools in the poorer states."

Some observers commented that the CED plan looked like an attempt to put over Federal aid on a national basis by starting with eleven "poorer states," and questioned whether such aid would prove even financially desirable, aside from the danger of Federal control.

The Federal Constitution, aid critics point out, imposes no limits on the taxing powers of states. An analysis of available data would show that few school districts have reached the legal limit of their taxing or borrowing power.

Since Federal interest rates are running higher than those paid by local authorities, these critics argue that the overall cost of Federal aid would be greater than the cost if individual areas continue to shoulder their school bills.

Reds in Caribbean: The testimony of the Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, General C. P. Cabell, shows a shocking and massive penetration by the Communists into Latin America.

Cabell told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in November that some 240,000 Communists, with an additional 700,000 fellow travelers, have neatly woven themselves into the fabric of the 20 Latin American republics. Cabell's testimony was released last week.

From a Soviet slush fund of well over a half billion dollars a year and contributions from Red China and other satellite sources, the Communists have established hundreds of front organizations, flooded the republics with Red literature coming from Mexico, financed students' and party members' trips to Communist countries abroad (where agents get top orders), and infiltrated government bodies, unions, and communications to an astounding degree. Their tactics, only half-heartedly opposed by such countries as Argentina and Mexico, have boosted party membership by 10 per cent since 1958, with 200,000 now lodged in Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Chile and Cuba.

Regarding Cuba, Cabell stated that it is a training ground for Communists, that Castro has wiped out the anti-Batista, anti-Communist organization BRAC (Bureau of Resistance to Communist Activities), and that in the Communist view Castro "represents leadership of a nationalistic, bourgeois-democratic revolution which precedes a Communist rise to power."

The Soviet Union still plays the biggest role of all Communist countries in Latin America, not only through providing funds, but by training Communist agents in the Soviet Union for two or three years. The Soviets have also stepped up their trading in the area. A recent article in *US News and World Report* shows that in January Brazil and Chile were trying to swap wheat and copper, respectively, with the USSR. Last December, Brazil agreed to a 200 million dollar trade deal with Russia, similar to a recent exchange of goods between Soviet-dominated countries and Argentina and Uruguay.

The Red hand of China has grasped firm hold in the area, too. Early last year, reports Cabell, "Latin American Communist representatives received specific advice and guidance from Mao Tze-tung . . . . " The men of Mao have been extremely effective in spreading propaganda among the 11,000 Chinese in Lima and the 20,000 in Havana. Chinese broadcasts have been stepped up to 14 programs a week, and the New China Democratic Alliance, a Communist front, has announced establishment of a Chinese language newspaper in Cuba.

In fact, there is the danger that much of the press will be Communist influenced and controlled. "Important national press associations in Brazil, Peru, and Venezuela have given some official recognition to the [Communist front] International Organization of Journalists." So reads the disturbing report from the United States' top intelligence outfit.

Nuclear Nonsense: The program of atomic public power plants received a smashing blow last week when David E. Lilienthal (former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission) told the press that the commercial possibilities of atomic power plants have been "grossly oversold" to the American public. "By and large, the program has been quite a flop," said Lilienthal, the original author of the plan, "and is not to be taken seriously." He added that Soviet Russia "is just as disillusioned with atomic energy as we are."

Thus, the progenitor of what has turned out to be a gigantic and costly boondoggle now repudiates his brainchild. In a HUMAN EVENTS article on February 11, 1956, entitled "Nuclear Nonsense," atomic specialist David Shea Teeple denounced the program as wasteful and dangerous; and HUMAN EVENTS since that time has been the only publication which has consistently run critical reports of the whole business. The *reductio ad absurdum* came when the big show-piece of the program, the civilian reactor at Shippingport, Pennsylvania, was revealed as producing electric current at a cost about eight times the ordinary coal-fueled electric generating plants. The US Government is reported to have spent over $121 million building the plant.

Critics of the atomic power plant project have frequently made the point that the waste is not merely the huge disparity in dollar cost production; it is also the diversion of technical and scientific skills to such experimentation from the over-riding mission of developing and producing weapons, such as ICBM's.

As a result of the Lilienthal somersault, critics now nourish hope that the whole project will be scrapped; thereby, it is estimated, a saving of at least $300 million

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, United States Senator from Georgia: "HUMAN EVENTS presents a concise analysis of public issues and I find it most interesting and informative."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be made. In any case, legislators are now likely to take a good hard look at requests for atomic power funds.

California's Courts: Since the bitter election fight of 1958 when Senator William F. Knowland and the Right-to-Work amendment on the ballot suffered defeat, the unions have been on easy street in the Golden State.

In recent weeks, judges (who are elected in California) denied reinstatement to two members ousted from their union for campaigning for Right-to-Work, and let loose a convicted felon (a member of the Teamsters) to attend a union meeting.

Two machinists, Cecil Mitchell and John Mulgrew, were dropped from local lodge 727-E last May because they campaigned for a Right-to-Work amendment on the ballot. This was upheld by the President of the International Association of Machinists, Albert J. Hayes, who apparently found the firing of union members for political beliefs within the code of the Ethical Practices Committee of the AFL-CIO, which he also heads.

Both members then sued the union for $85,000, but Superior Court Judge Jesse J. Frampton ruled for the union, claiming it was a mark of disloyalty for the ousted pair to disagree with the union's stated philosophy.

Mitchell, who was president of local 727-E for 15 years, stated he once violently opposed Right-to-Work in a speech, but said he started to change his mind when he couldn't field the arguments that came from the audience. "A few weeks later," remarked Mitchell, "I was approached by people from a local Right-to-Work committee." He said they gave him some literature to read and "the more I read the more I became convinced that I'd been wrong and that joining a union should be strictly voluntary."

Edward Franzen, attorney for the ousted machinists, who are now appealing the case, stated: "If the unions can control the political activities of their members, then our type of free government is ending."

● In another California case, Frank J. Matula, who was sentenced to a six-month prison term last October and fined $2500 for lying to the State Legislature about his connections with a rubbish monopoly, was granted a "two week furlough" from his prison farm to attend a Teamster conference in Washington, D.C., as its international union trustee.

Although Matula was appointed to the position of trusteeship by Hoffa after a Superior Court decision found him guilty of perjury, Judge Burton H. Noble (who had originally sentenced him) said it was necessary for Matula to attend the conference or he might lose his position with the union!

Between Covers: To paraphrase Mark Twain's remark about the weather, everybody talks about the farm problem, but nobody does anything about it. *The Great Farm Problem* by Dr. William H. Peterson (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, $5) is a book which says what ought to be done.

The January 21 HUMAN EVENTS article, "The Great Farm Problem," was excerpted from this book.

Under the administration of both major parties during the last three decades, American agriculture has been subjected to more and more experimentation and tinkering. How did this situation come about? How has the Government in the greatest democracy in the world become so entangled in a private industry?

William H. Peterson, associate professor of economics at New York University and contributor of articles on business and economics to the *Wall Street Journal*, puts the whole business of agricultural subsidies, parity prices, and "soil banks" into proper perspective.

Reviewing the entire history of American farming from colonial times to the present day, he demonstrates that agriculture is one business among many and comes up with a solution in the best interests of the farmer and in keeping with the American free enterprise tradition.

This is the book of the year for the concerned taxpayer, the worried member of Congress, the newspaper commentator, the college economics and history teacher —and, above all, for the would-be independent American farmer himself.

Young GOP: "There is a steady trend to conservatism in America today, and we think the Young Republicans are helping to show the way," YR National Chairman Ned Cushing told HUMAN EVENTS at the conclusion of the Young GOP's National Leadership Training School held in the Nation's Capital January 18 to 22.

Cushing pointed out that "the platform we adopted in Denver this summer was the most conservative in the history of the Federation. It shows that the YR's take their stand for principle, not for expediency."

Further evidence of the resurgence of conservatism among younger voters was provided at the Leadership School itself. YR leaders from 42 states gave a standing ovation to Senator Barry Goldwater, who stressed devotion to principle and hard work as the keys to victory. He cited his own state to show what the GOP can do: In 1946, Arizona's registered Democrats outnumbered the Republicans eight-to-one; now, after a decade of organization work, GOP registration equals the Democrats.

The enthusiasm and determination displayed during the sessions led many observers to agree with YR leader Cushing when he termed it "the most successful leadership school in the history of the YR Federation."

Dinner: Now that Nelson Rockefeller, "the man who came to dinner but couldn't find time to eat," has left town, longtime Washington supporters of Nixon for President will hold a $5-a-plate dinner for Dick and Pat February 11 in the ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel. For information contact the League of Republican Women, 1732 Massachusetts Ave., N. W.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS TO HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. For change of address send old address (EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958 and 1959 volumes available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 6 HUMAN EVENTS February 11, 1960

Article Section

Immigration: 1960 Issue

The Walter-McCarran Act is Again Being Attacked

By MILTON M. LORY
President, American Coalition of Patriotic Societies

IT'S AN ELECTION YEAR, and office-hungry politicians — including some would-be Presidents— are redoubling their attack on the Walter-McCarran Act, willing to sacrifice our carefully-wrought immigration system for another term in office, regardless of the consequences for the Nation. They are being joined in their efforts by the Communists (who have their own ends in mind), by professional "liberals" and spokesmen for minority ethnic blocs, and by a large number of misguided citizens who are unaware of the actual provisions of the Act and of the dangers threatening if any of a host of amendments, currently hanging fire, are adopted.

The attack is not new; it began before the Walter-McCarran Act was passed over President Truman's veto in 1952, and it hits a peak just before elections. In 1952, for example, even before the Act had been given a chance to work, leaders of both parties were denouncing it. Clare Boothe Luce told a Chicago television audience that fall (mindful of Chicago's concentration of nationality groups) that General Eisenhower and the GOP opposed "discriminatory" immigration policies; she noted that the authors, Representative Francis Walter of Pennsylvania and the late Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada, were both Democrats.

At the same time, the Democratic platform that year pledged "continuing revision of our immigration and naturalization laws to do away with any unjust and unfair practices against national groups which have contributed some of our best citizens," which, many big-city Democrats were quick to claim, meant drastic revision of the Act.

It did not matter who won; both parties' spokesmen promised wholesale changes in the Walter-McCarran Act. But these party leaders had conveniently forgotten that a majority of each party in each house of Congress had voted to override Truman's veto, and when Congress convened in 1953, the law remained on the books.

Four years later, a series of amendments almost slid through Congress on the last day of the 1956 session — amendments which would have emasculated our immigration laws — and were stopped only by Representative Walter's determined stand in the House. Similar tactics may be tried this year.

THE WALTER-MCCARRAN ACT, the object of these attacks, is one of the most misunderstood on the books. Such a propaganda barrage has been laid down by its opponents that large numbers of Americans have no knowledge of the Act except a vague feeling that it is somehow "racist" and "restrictive" and "makes second-class citizens out of some people." None of these claims is true, but defenders of the law have had a hard time presenting the facts to the public.

The Act was the product of five years' study and preparation, the result of a determined effort to codify our immigration laws for the first time in the Nation's history. Before 1952, a welter of complicated and conflicting statutes, passed at various times, comprised the immigration "policy" of the United States.

It has been said that the Act was developed over the longest period of time ever devoted to a single piece of legislation in the history of Congress. It was endorsed by both the State and Justice Departments, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. As previously mentioned, it commanded majorities of both parties in both houses of Congress when it was passed over Truman's veto. Among the groups supporting it were organizations of citizens of Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Filipino descent—surprising supporters of a law so often branded "racist."

In actual fact, the "racist" charge is ridiculous. The opposite is true; the Walter-McCarran Act removed the racial barriers of previous immigration laws, determining quotas for all nations, European and Asiatic, on the same basis, which is why the citizens of Asian origin supported it. Congressman Walter Judd, a long-time missionary in China and an authority on the Far East, supported the law.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In many ways the Walter-McCarran Act is the most liberal immigration law in the Nation's history—so liberal that the American Civil Liberties Union endorsed several parts of it. For the first time, ex-Communists may be admitted to this country if they can convince security officials they have had a genuine change of heart; formerly, membership in the Communist party at any time was enough to bar a prospective immigrant. (At the same time, the Act strengthens security regulations against admitting Communists.) Also for the first time, the alien husband of an American citizen is admitted quota-free; separations of families are no longer necessitated by immigration laws. Because of this and other parts of the law, immigration is well in excess of the quota established by the Act—a fact usually glossed over by its opponents.

Immigration for the fiscal year 1956-57, in fact, was the highest in thirty years, totalling 326,000—a strange figure indeed under a "restrictive" law. Though part of this total consisted of Hungarian and other refugees admitted under several special refugee acts, immigration in the more normal 1957-58 (the last year for which figures are available) still stood at 253,000, which was 100,000 above the quota and was the fourth highest total in thirty years.

THE FOCUS OF THE ATTACK on the Walter-McCarran Act is the "National Origin Quota System"—the heart of our immigration policy. Under this system, each nationality's quota is fixed at one-sixth of one per cent of the number of people of that nationality who were residing in the United States in 1920. In addition, natives of Canada and the independent Latin American countries are admitted without any limit.

The attack on the national origin quota system takes many forms. Senator John F. Kennedy has introduced one of this Congress' most extreme proposals, which would abolish the national origin system entirely and set up instead an over-all annual quota of 250,000, in place of the present 150,000. Each country's share of that 250,000 is figured on the basis of its own population rather than America's, and no country could have a quota of more than 25,000. (Under the present law Great Britain has 65,000.) Kennedy also desires a great increase in several kinds of non-quota immigration.

A bill introduced by New York Congressman Emanuel Celler is an even more blatant bid for votes; it would let the President divide up the 250,000 quota annually, subject only to a veto by Congress, in which case the previous year's arrangement remains in effect. In practice, of course, the quotas would be established by some bureaucrat who would be subject to immense pressures from nationality groups and foreign embassies, and the quotas would be horse-traded for votes and other special favors, probably until a congressional committee could expose the situation.

Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota—interestingly enough, both Kennedy and Humphrey are highly active Democratic Presidential candidates—has introduced a milder proposal, although when he did so he declared his opposition to the present quota system in principle. But for now Humphrey will settle for a redistribution of the unused quotas of Great Britain and a few other countries. Left-over quota spaces of one European country would be available to other European countries the next year, and the same would hold true for Asia and Africa. Moreover, Humphrey would refigure the over-all quota at one-seventh of one per cent of the United States' 1950 population, which would add 60,000 immigrants annually. He also wants to permit persons of Asian origin now resident in South America—estimated to number 600,000—to come here quota-free.

Still another proposal, sponsored by Republican Senators Jacob Javits, Clifford Case, Kenneth Keating and Leverett Saltonstall, would outdo Humphrey's by refiguring the quota at one-sixth of one per cent of the 1950 population, adding 85,000 to current quotas. Left-over quotas would be redistributed by the President each year.

These and similar proposals would not only increase immigration, but they would change its character radically, since between 1920 and 1950 great numbers of non-quota immigrants came in under refugee and other special acts. These refugees are largely from Eastern and Southern Europe, so opponents of the proposed amendments are frequently branded as "bigots."

But the would-be amenders fail to mention that the big-city voting blocs in many crucial states are largely composed of persons of Eastern and Southern European origins. Large influxes into this country from these nations would probably result in the new immigrants' also gravitating to the big cities and swelling those voting blocs. This in turn would lead to more power for the bloc leaders, who could trade votes for further immigration favors, enlarging the blocs yet again, and incidentally encouraging the members of these groups to think of themselves not as individuals, but as part of a bloc, as "hyphenated Americans"; indeed, as the very "second-class citizens" the sponsors wring their hands over. But this does not worry some politicians, who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are willing to continue this vicious circle as long as it serves their immediate purposes.

THE COMMUNISTS have their own special reasons for hating the Walter-McCarran Act: it includes provisions for the deportation of alien residents who are Communists, and for taking away the citizenship of naturalized Communists and deporting them. The law has also established rules for excluding potential immigrants on security grounds, if they are Communists, anarchists, or advocates of totalitarian dictatorship, or if the Attorney General or local consul has valid reason to believe the potential immigrant would engage in subversive activities in the United States.

It is no wonder that less than three months ago the Communist *Worker* in a bitter attack called for immediate repeal of the Walter-McCarran Act. Probably the most savage denunciations of the Act have come from the late Abner Green, long-time head of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, cited as a Communist front by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Green wrote a number of vitriolic tracts against the law. His last effort was made "from the grave"—when the *Worker* used his recent death as a springboard for its latest attack.

Actually, the *Worker* is partly playing to the galleries, since security procedures are sometimes extremely difficult to apply, particularly in the case of refugees from Communist-dominated countries. In 1956, for example, the American consul in Hong Kong, Maurice S. Rose, reported that Chinese girls came into Hong Kong seeking American husbands, generally sailors; if a girl got married and applied for a visa, she claimed she was the only child (with both parents dead), never was employed and never went to school. The consul said he had no way to even begin a security investigation. It is unlikely the Communists would overlook such an easy method of getting agents into this country.

More important numerically than the Red China refugees are those from Eastern and Southern Europe—the ones the vote-hungry politicians would have us admit in greater numbers, although we have already accepted more than twice as many as any other country since World War II (about one million displaced persons and refugees), and despite inadequate security investigations. The situation after the Hungarian Revolution in 1956 pointed up the problem: the huge flood of Hungarians crossing into Austria inundated the security officers trying to weed out the Communist plants from the genuine refugees.

The President's Commission on Government Security wrote in 1957: "The screening that took place, first in Europe and then upon arrival of the aliens in Camp Kilmer, N. J., did not meet acceptable standards. The magnitude of the project precluded it."

Over 38,000 Hungarians were admitted within a year; there were never more than 17 immigration officers in Austria. Twenty-two of these Hungarians have since been deported from the United States for Communist affiliations. There could be many more; for two weeks the Freedom Fighters controlled the country and had hopes of winning, and during that time the persons most likely to be fleeing the country were the Communists; after the brutal suppression of the Revolution, armed guards were patrolling the border between Austria and Hungary, making their own grim "security check." Most of the Hungarians now in this country are genuine anti-Communists, but the deportation of some as Communists suggests that security procedures were not good enough, and others, better able to conceal themselves, are likely to remain here.

Similarly, it is difficult to check the backgrounds of refugees from other Soviet satellites. The former head of the Immigration Detail in Europe told the Joint Committee which prepared the Walter-McCarran Act that one-third of the displaced persons coming into the United States were ineligible under normal security regulations; before the Refugee Relief Act was passed in 1953, American security officers stationed in Europe testified that 40 per cent of the refugees there were subversive or criminal. Yet there are bills now pending in the House and Senate to bring in still more refugees, without providing adequate security precautions.

If any amendments are to be made to the Walter-McCarran Act at this session of Congress, they should be designed to tighten security procedures on all borders and overseas. Professor Anthony T. Bouscaren of Le Moyne College, a careful student of security problems in immigration, has recommended stronger security measures and better staffing of important consular posts overseas where Communists are particularly likely to seek admission. Often junior officers are given "on-the-job training" in these key posts, making decisions which would tax the expert.

Another danger is that many aliens who are unable to gain admittance into the United States, obtain visas to Canada and Latin America and then cross the border and "lose themselves" in this country. Responsible estimates have placed the total number of illegal residents here at three million, including ship-jumpers, migrant Mexican agri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cultural workers who stay, and persons on temporary visas who just stay on after their visas expire. No one knows how many of them are Communist agents. These illegal "immigrants" constitute one of our major security problems; until something can be done about them, the country does not need to create additional problems by expanding refugee immigration without first having tighter security.

ADVOCATES OF INCREASED immigration are not all Communists or vote-seeking demagogues; they include many sincere persons who are thrilled by the romantic picture of America as the Land of Opportunity, where the Statue of Liberty says, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." These somewhat starry-eyed opponents of the Walter-McCarran Act want more immigration to help ease the population problems of other parts of the world. By increasing immigration, they claim, the United States will earn "international good will."

But this country has passed its great expansion period, and is rapidly running out of room for its own people, let alone additional immigrants. In fact, some students of the problem are beginning to suggest a cutback in American immigration. There are some areas in the world which still need people—Australia, which is currently able to assimilate immigrants much faster than our country because its population is so small to begin with; the Dutch end of New Guinea; large areas in Africa and South America.

For the United States to let people in merely because of overcrowding in their home countries, without regard to the population problems which would be created here, could be disastrous for the Nation—and for the world, since it could undermine that American strength which is the principal defense against communism.

Nor is there any realistic hope that permitting willy-nilly immigration here would even dent the population problems in many parts of the world. Japan's already-overcrowded islands are growing at the rate of two million people a year; Europe's surplus, despite stable or declining populations in many countries, is estimated at 79 million people. Unless the United States simply admits everyone who wants to come, there is no feasible method of admitting more immigrants that would do anything except multiply our own problems.

Increased immigration could create serious unemployment problems in this country. It is a curious coincidence that many of the same Congressmen pushing for increased immigration are also backing expensive welfare schemes such as the Depressed Areas Bill to take care of already-unemployed Americans. (They seem to think our welfare funds are inexhaustible.) If widespread unemployment did occur, many of the new arrivals might find that the "promised land" would consist of a relief check and a shabby room while they learn our language and customs.

Yet despite all these facts, the pressure to gut the Walter-McCarran Act continues. This year, politicians of both parties have their eyes on the large ethnic voting blocs which can be decisive in big states such as New York, Michigan and Illinois; leaders of these blocs are aiming to increase their power by enlarging their blocs; the Communists are out to bring in more of their agents by razing the security barriers to immigration. Together, they make a formidable front—opposed only by several American patriotic societies and a few Congressmen willing to put principle and their Nation's interest above partisan politics.

These Congressmen need the support of their constituents and the American people if they are to withstand the great pressures being brought to bear on them. The average American, anti-Communist, thinking of himself only as an American and not as a member of any other "bloc," must tell his elected representatives how he feels about the Walter-McCarran Act. If he does not, then in the press of legislation during the final moments of this Congress, the efforts to undermine our vitally important immigration system may be successful. The results could be catastrophic.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "IMMIGRATION: 1960 ISSUE" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED